



+ Site Map
+ NASA Home



FIND IT @ NASA :

+ GO



+ Exploration Home

Acquisition Portal
& Documents

Acquisition Portal

CE&R BAA FAQs

- ACQUISITION PORTAL

+ DOCUMENTS

+ TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT
+ CONSTELLATION SYSTEMS

+ Benefits
+ Announcements
+ Calendar

- For the CE&R BAA proposals, there are 2 major scope areas described in the industry day briefing charts: 1) Preliminary Concepts for Human Lunar Exploration, and 2) Initial CEV Concept. Are proposals submitted meant to address both of these areas in an integrated fashion a single proposal or can proposers submit separate proposals for each area?
- Does the offeror have to propose a complete Constellation level concept or can the offeror look at parts of the Constellation concept for further exploration and refinement. For example could an offeror just look at concepts for Lunar bases and not address the transportation element? Or another example could an offeror look at common software development methodologies across the Constellation/CEV enterprise and not address other functional elements?
- I understand that I have missed the submission date for NOI's but hope that I am still able to submit a response to the upcoming BAA's.
- In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - Does the page count limitation referenced in Section IV include the cost volume? If not, is there a page limit for the cost volume?
- In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - On page 9, in section VI, paragraph 2b titled Criteria 2, Technical Merit, the 5th bullet is a duplication of the last sentence in the 4th bullet.
- In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - Is there a preferred electronic format for the proposal submittal (MS Word, PDF, etc)?
- In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - Is there a size limitation for the electronic submittal?
- In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - On page 4, in section III, paragraph 3a titled, Concept Area 1 Preliminary Concepts for Human Lunar Exploration, the first sentence needs additional clarification. It reads as follows: Based on the Vision for Space Exploration, the offeror shall make recommendations for the scientific, economic, and security objectives of lunar exploration. How much of the total proposal and contractual effort does the government expect to be dedicated to consideration of these objectives? Should we be using the Level 0 requirements document as the basic objectives document for establishing a system of systems approach?
- The BAA Section IV Page Limitations, indicates a total of 30 and 25 pages for both Concept Areas and Concept 1, respectively. Does this total page count include the Contractor developed statement of work and the cost proposal?
- Can the offeror submit two (2) proposals?
- Can NASA Centers participate on BAAs, if so, are Government Task Agreements required?
- What level of costing is required in the proposal?
- On the Near Term Acquisition Strategy Chart From the 7 May Presolicitation Conference (Chart 21) it shows a SRR at the end of August or the start of September. Does NASA intend to have the SRR in August, so should it be included in the option period of the proposal?
- On page 5, in section III, Part 1b, titled Concept Area 2 Crew Exploration Vehicle, the last sentence calls for a risk assessment and mitigation outline for the proposed (CEV) concept and approach although there is no request for an initial CEV concept for a technical solution that meets the allocated functionality.
- Since Level I Requirements are not released until BAA award, can the contractors submit proposals other than FFP such as FPLOE, CPFF etc?
- Is a separate procurement planned for CEV Systems Engineering and Integration (SE&I)?
- In the BAA for Concept Exploration & Refinement Pre Solicitation Briefing conducted by the NASA Office of Exploration Systems on May 7, 2004, the Proposal Outline, presented on page15, included a Transmittal Letter and a Management Approach. Neither item is discussed in Section III, Proposals section of the Draft BAA. Does NASA want a Transmittal Letter and a specific

Management Approach section to be included in our response to the subject BAA?

- When are the recommendations due for "system and subsystem components that are common or extensible to Mars"?
- What levels of cost data are required for the 45-, 90- and 180-day milestones?
- Are there funding profile constraints that we should use to assess affordability of Project Constellation or will each contractor derive his own?
- It is assumed as shown in Chart 5 of the May 7th Briefing, that the Level 1 Requirements will be released at BAA award to Contractors.
- One gets the sense from the briefing that the CE&R BAA is very highly focused on the lunar mission. An alternative approach would be to include the full scope of CEV operational environments with an emphasis on the lunar application. Is the CE&R BAA scope limited to the lunar mission application only, or can it include a broader architecture application perspective (ETO, LEO, Lunar, Mars, asteroid, etc.)?
- Where does industry offer items that could be performed once for NASA and made available for the benefit of all potential CEV primes?
- Is the CE&R BAA intended only for those companies interested in the CEV Prime contract role?
- Recommend NASA consideration of an alternate transaction type (such as a cooperative agreement) that would facilitate a cost-sharing arrangement. Such an arrangement would encourage the participant to invest its own funds to further enhance data products being delivered.
- Question regarding briefing at conference on 7 May 2004: "Page 9 of the brief indicates the possibility of an integrator beginning in approximately FY 05. If the decision is to make the integrator a contracted activity, will participation in a BAA or on a contractor CEV team create a conflict situation precluding a contractor from being the integrator?"
- The presentation indicates the RFI responses will be 'scored'. What, if any, are the implications of these scores to the contractors who submit them? Will these scores have any bearing on the BAA evaluations?
- Discuss the degree the BAA will be focused on architectures versus CEV. Will it be mostly architecture definition with how CEV fits into the architecture, or a focus on CEV supported by some architecture thinking? Page 11 and 12 would indicate some balance but page 13 is very heavily CEV focused.
- Chart #25 mentions a 5-page SOW. Is this to be generated entirely by the contractor? If so, how do we ensure contractors are doing similar work? Please consider providing a sample/template for the SOW to enable us to more closely match the government's desired formats and minimum work content.
- Chart #16 refers to a \$3M base award with \$3M in options and Chart #15 refers to "month to month" options. Please consider not having the options run on a month-to-month basis to allow better work planning. What will be the criteria for exercising these options? What sort of work is expected to be performed and are we to propose that work in June? If so, how are we to construct a SOW for this period? Please delineate the work scope for both the base and option periods.
- Chart #11 refers to the "initial CEV concept". What do we mean by the "CEV" specifically? Is the CEV just the entry vehicle that carries humans? Does it include transfer stages, service modules, EVA/servicing platforms, humanrated launch system and/or adapters, launch escape system, etc.? What elements/functions will be covered by the "Initial CEV Concept" CE&R task and the follow-on CEV procurement? Is it only the systems required to support Spiral 1?
- Chart #11 only mentions Human Lunar Exploration as a mission for the architecture. Will the CEV have to perform emergency crew return or crew rotation missions to ISS? Should our architecture examine the impacts of these requirements? Should the architecture address the cargo requirements for ISS after the Shuttle is retired? Should the architecture address satellite/platform servicing or in-space assembly of platforms requiring EVA or remote manipulation?
- Chart # 9 refers to "human-rated" and "heavy-lift" launch capability. Will the analysis of these launch systems be included in the scope of the CE&R effort?
- Chart #11 asks us to provide a development plan to support the uncrewed CEV flight in 2011 and crewed flight in 2014. Please provide additional detail into the objectives and requirements for each of the missions planned for 2011 and 2014. Is the 2011 mission an uncrewed flight of a human-rated system? If so, why are three years needed between flights? Can we propose a period shorter than three years between flights? Is the 2014 system expected to meet the lunar mission requirements?
- Chart #25 mentions a 25 MB limit for the proposal in Microsoft Word format. Based on experience with previous similar proposals, this seems like a highly constraining size limitation given today's server and file transfer technology. This limitation may severely impact our ability to respond effectively. Previous proposals have greatly exceeded this requirement -- even in Adobe Acrobat PDF. Microsoft Word documents with embedded graphic are much less efficient in size allocation than PDF files. Please consider increasing this limitation to 100 MB and/or allowing the Word file to be compressed into a Zip format and allowing the use of PDF files. We strongly encourage the continued use of electronic submittals.
- Chart #17 requires all data to be "unlimited rights", but says the government will "protect the competitive nature of the contractor's design solution relating to CEV". Does this mean all data on the CEV system can be proposed only as competition sensitive through the down select and becomes unlimited rights after that time? It also seems to imply that data on all other non-CEV systems in the architecture cannot even be treated as competition sensitive; however, there will

certainly be future procurements for these systems just as there will be for CEV. Please consider allowing all data to be treated as "competition sensitive" until after a single contractor is selected for that particular system (CEV or non-CEV).

- Chart #12 mentions Technical Interchange Meetings at NASA HQ. Since this is a FFP proposal, please provide the desired number of these meetings and potential time-frames in the BAA to ensure we budget adequately for a desired minimum number of meetings. Please provide any additional meeting locations or potential travel required in advance to enable proper costing.
- Chart #6 shows a downselect to a single CEV contractor based partly (one-third) on a CEV demo flight. How will the government ensure that these competing demo flights will have similar levels of difficulty and technology demonstration? Please consider providing common goals and objectives that each of the contractor's flight vehicles must meet. What if one of the contractor's missions can't be accomplished due to a launch failure?
- Is the WBS written for a Code-T organization or for the Exploration Program? The WBS implies that Code-T will manage Exploration Operations.
- Design, Development, and Systems Engineering functions seem to be combined with Operations functions. This may be to facilitate design-build-operations collaboration. Please clarify.
- On page 9 of the BAA, section 4, last sentence states: "Proposals shall be submitted in MS WORD or EXCEL, and may also include a PDF version". Does NASA anticipate/desire receipt of a self-calculating Excel spreadsheet?
- Is a flight demonstration required under the CEV development plan?
- Should the system-of-systems concept address robotic precursors and surface systems?
- If industry plans to propose cost sharing from private funding in addition to the Government funding would that be positive?
- Has a small business liaison been established within Code T to facilitate small business participation?
- Is the July 16th proposal submission date intact and firm for this BAA?

For the CE&R BAA proposals, there are 2 major scope areas described in the industry day briefing charts: 1) Preliminary Concepts for Human Lunar Exploration, and 2) Initial CEV Concept. Are proposals submitted meant to address both of these areas in an integrated fashion a single proposal or can proposers submit separate proposals for each area?

Offerors may provide either a single integrated proposal or a severable proposal that may allow the Government to select either both areas or Concept Area 1 only. If the proposal is technically severable, the cost section should also be severable.

[Back to Top](#)

Does the offeror have to propose a complete Constellation level concept or can the offeror look at parts of the Constellation concept for further exploration and refinement. For example could an offeror just look at concepts for Lunar bases and not address the transportation element? Or another example could an offeror look at common software development methodologies across the Constellation/CEV enterprise and not address other functional elements?

Refer to Final BAA Section III. Offeror must propose a complete system-of-systems concept.

[Back to Top](#)

I understand that I have missed the submission date for NOI's but hope that I am still able to submit a response to the upcoming BAA's.

NOI's may be submitted through midnight June 28, 2004. However failure to submit a NOI does not preclude an offeror from submitting a proposal in response to the BAA.

[Back to Top](#)

In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - Does the page count limitation referenced in Section IV include the cost volume? If not, is there a page limit for the cost volume?

Yes, the page count is intended to be inclusive of all sections.

[Back to Top](#)

In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - On page 9, in section VI, paragraph 2b titled Criteria 2, Technical Merit, the 5th bullet is a duplication of the last sentence in the 4th bullet.

The 5th bullet is a duplication and was removed in the Final BAA.

[Back to Top](#)

In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - Is there a preferred electronic format for the proposal submittal (MS Word, PDF, etc)?

See Final BAA Section IV.Q7.

[Back to Top](#)

In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - Is there a size limitation for the electronic submittal?

The BAA only addresses a page limitation. The Government elected to not make the electronic proposals size limited also.

[*Back to Top*](#)

In response to the DRAFT CE&R BAA - On page 4, in section III, paragraph 3a titled, Concept Area 1 Preliminary Concepts for Human Lunar Exploration, the first sentence needs additional clarification. It reads as follows: Based on the Vision for Space Exploration, the offeror shall make recommendations for the scientific, economic, and security objectives of lunar exploration. How much of the total proposal and contractual effort does the government expect to be dedicated to consideration of these objectives? Should we be using the Level 0 requirements document as the basic objectives document for establishing a system of systems approach?

As discussed during the Industry Day on June 18, 2004, offerors are requested to propose recommendations of what they believe to be the scientific, economic, and security objectives based on the Vision for Space Exploration and the applicable Level 0 Exploration requirements as stipulated at the Industry Day.

[*Back to Top*](#)

The BAA Section IV Page Limitations, indicates a total of 30 and 25 pages for both Concept Areas and Concept 1, respectively. Does this total page count include the Contractor developed statement of work and the cost proposal?

Yes.

[*Back to Top*](#)**Can the offeror submit two (2) proposals?**

There is no prohibition against an offeror submitting more than one proposal, however the Government does not anticipate awarding more than one contract to an offeror submitting multiple proposals.

[*Back to Top*](#)**Can NASA Centers participate on BAAs, if so, are Government Task Agreements required?**

Centers are not permitted to participate on this BAA. The BAA will be amended to emphasize this point. See Final BAA, Section II. paragraph 1.

[*Back to Top*](#)**What level of costing is required in the proposal?**

Cost is required at the levels requested in the BAA on page 7 Part 3, Cost Proposal. Offerors are welcome to provide additional details at lower levels.

[*Back to Top*](#)

On the Near Term Acquisition Strategy Chart From the 7 May Presolicitation Conference (Chart 21) it shows a SRR at the end of August or the start of September. Does NASA intend to have the SRR in August, so should it be included in the option period of the proposal?

No the SRR is not part of the option, but is planned to be part of the contracts resulting from the CEV RFP.

[*Back to Top*](#)

On page 5, in section III, Part 1b, titled Concept Area 2 Crew Exploration Vehicle, the last sentence calls for a risk assessment and mitigation outline for the proposed (CEV) concept and approach although there is no request for an initial CEV concept for a technical solution that meets the allocated functionality.

See Final BAA Section III, paragraph 3.a.

[*Back to Top*](#)

Since Level I Requirements are not released until BAA award, can the contractors submit proposals other than FFP such as FPLOE, CPFF etc?

See BAA Section I.8.

[*Back to Top*](#)**Is a separate procurement planned for CEV Systems Engineering and Integration (SE&I)?**

The decision on the SE&I approach is not finalized. See chart 18 of the June 18, 2004 Industry Day briefing.

[Back to Top](#)

In the BAA for Concept Exploration & Refinement Pre Solicitation Briefing conducted by the NASA Office of Exploration Systems on May 7, 2004, the Proposal Outline, presented on page15, included a Transmittal Letter and a Management Approach. Neither item is discussed in Section III, Proposals section of the Draft BAA. Does NASA want a Transmittal Letter and a specific Management Approach section to be included in our response to the subject BAA?

No.

[Back to Top](#)

When are the recommendations due for "system and subsystem components that are common or extensible to Mars??

See Final BAA Section III, 3a. The information is due with the proposal.

[Back to Top](#)

What levels of cost data are required for the 45-, 90- and 180-day milestones?

Data is now required monthly. Fidelity is addressed on chart 33 of the June 18, 2004 Industry Day briefing.

[Back to Top](#)

Are there funding profile constraints that we should use to assess affordability of Project Constellation or will each contractor derive his own?

Funding profile constraints will not be addressed at this time.

[Back to Top](#)

It is assumed as shown in Chart 5 of the May 7th Briefing, that the Level 1 Requirements will be released at BAA award to Contractors.

Level 0 is available for offerors. The level 1 requirements will developed by the Government and shared with contract awardees early in the performance period and will be iterated pending CEV RFP release.

[Back to Top](#)

One gets the sense from the briefing that the CE&R BAA is very highly focused on the lunar mission. An alternative approach would be to include the full scope of CEV operational environments with an emphasis on the lunar application. Is the CE&R BAA scope limited to the lunar mission application only, or can it include a broader architecture application perspective (ETO, LEO, Lunar, Mars, asteroid, etc.?)

See the Final BAA Section III, 3.a. under Technical Concept.

[Back to Top](#)

Where does industry offer items that could be performed once for NASA and made available for the benefit of all potential CEV primes?

Industry can offer these items in the proposal, provided it is part of an exploration system-of-systems concept.

[Back to Top](#)

Is the CE&R BAA intended only for those companies interested in the CEV Prime contract role?

No. See Final BAA, Introduction, paragraph 6 or chart 30 from the June 18, 2004 Industry Day briefing. Offerors may propose under Concept Area 1 or Concept Areas 1 and 2. Proposals will not be accepted that only address Concept Area 2.

[Back to Top](#)

Recommend NASA consideration of an alternate transaction type (such as a cooperative agreement) that would facilitate a cost-sharing arrangement. Such an arrangement would encourage the participant to invest its own funds to further enhance data products being delivered.

This BAA only allows for FFP, CPFF, and CR no fee contracts.

[Back to Top](#)

Question regarding briefing at conference on 7 May 2004: "Page 9 of the brief indicates the possibility of an integrator beginning in approximately FY 05. If the decision is to make the integrator a contracted activity, will participation in a BAA or on a contractor CEV team create a conflict situation precluding a contractor from being the integrator?"

Participation in this CE&R BAA will not preclude a contractor from being the integrator.

[Back to Top](#)

The presentation indicates the RFI responses will be 'scored'. What, if any, are the implications of these scores to the contractors who submit them? Will these scores have any bearing on the BAA evaluations?

RFI responses will not have a bearing on the BAA evaluations.

[Back to Top](#)

Discuss the degree the BAA will be focused on architectures versus CEV. Will it be mostly architecture definition with how CEV fits into the architecture, or a focus on CEV supported by some architecture thinking? Page 11 and 12 would indicate some balance but page 13 is very heavily CEV focused.

See chart 30 from the June 18, 2004 Industry Day briefing.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #25 mentions a 5-page SOW. Is this to be generated entirely by the contractor? If so, how do we ensure contractors are doing similar work? Please consider providing a sample/template for the SOW to enable us to more closely match the government's desired formats and minimum work content.

The offeror is required to generate a SOW conducive to accomplishment of the proposed scope of work. The Government offers maximum flexibility in generating the SOW by not specifying a template. Offerors are expected to demonstrate in the SOW that there is a logical and thorough plan for accomplishment of the proposed work.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #16 refers to a \$3M base award with \$3M in options and Chart #15 refers to "month to month" options. Please consider not having the options run on a month-to-month basis to allow better work planning. What will be the criteria for exercising these options? What sort of work is expected to be performed and are we to propose that work in June? If so, how are we to construct a SOW for this period? Please delineate the work scope for both the base and option periods.

The criteria for exercising the option will be a function of work accomplishment during the base, Government Program Office objectives, and the scope of the proposed option relative to Program Office objectives. The option will be for a six-month period. Exercise of options is at the discretion of the Government.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #11 refers to the "initial CEV concept". What do we mean by the "CEV" specifically? Is the CEV just the entry vehicle that carries humans? Does it include transfer stages, service modules, EVA/servicing platforms, human-rated launch system and/or adapters, launch escape system, etc.? What elements/functions will be covered by the "Initial CEV Concept" CE&R task and the follow-on CEV procurement? Is it only the systems required to support Spiral 1?

See BAA Section III.3.b. and Technical Approach, Concept Area 2.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #11 only mentions Human Lunar Exploration as a mission for the architecture. Will the CEV have to perform emergency crew return or crew rotation missions to ISS? Should our architecture examine the impacts of these requirements? Should the architecture address the cargo requirements for ISS after the Shuttle is retired? Should the architecture address satellite/platform servicing or in-space assembly of platforms requiring EVA or remote manipulation?

The proposed CEV concept is not required to perform the identified ISS functions or assess impact, but may at the offeror's discretion. CEV functionality allocation as part of the exploration system-of-systems concept is up to the offeror to decide.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart # 9 refers to "human-rated" and "heavy-lift" launch capability. Will the analysis of these launch systems be included in the scope of the CE&R effort?

Yes, if it is part of the proposed exploration system-of-systems concept.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #11 asks us to provide a development plan to support the uncrewed CEV flight in 2011 and crewed flight in 2014. Please provide additional detail into the objectives and requirements for each of the missions planned for 2011 and 2014. Is the 2011 mission an uncrewed flight of a human-rated system? If so, why are three years needed between flights? Can we propose a period shorter than three years between flights? Is the 2014 system expected to meet the lunar mission requirements?

See June 18, 2004 Industry Day Chart 7. 2011 is uncrewed. Development objectives and requirements to be proposed by offeror.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #25 mentions a 25 MB limit for the proposal in Microsoft Word format. Based on experience with previous similar proposals, this seems like a highly constraining size limitation given today's server and file transfer technology. This limitation may severely impact our ability to respond effectively. Previous proposals have greatly exceeded this requirement -- even in Adobe Acrobat PDF. Microsoft Word documents with embedded graphic are much less efficient in size allocation than PDF files. Please consider increasing this limitation to 100 MB and/or allowing the Word file to be compressed into a Zip format and allowing the use of PDF files. We strongly encourage the continued use of electronic submittals.

No, only a page limitation, however excessive file sizes are discouraged due to potential readability and uploading challenges.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #17 requires all data to be "unlimited rights", but says the government will "protect the competitive nature of the contractor's design solution relating to CEV". Does this mean all data on the CEV system can be proposed only as competition sensitive through the down select and becomes unlimited rights after that time? It also seems to imply that data on all other non- CEV systems in the architecture cannot even be treated as competition sensitive; however, there will certainly be future procurements for these systems just as there will be for CEV. Please consider allowing all data to be treated as "competition sensitive" until after a single contractor is selected for that particular system (CEV or non-CEV).

See Final BAA Section VIII.11.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #12 mentions Technical Interchange Meetings at NASA HQ. Since this is a FFP proposal, please provide the desired number of these meetings and potential time-frames in the BAA to ensure we budget adequately for a desired minimum number of meetings. Please provide any additional meeting locations or potential travel required in advance to enable proper costing.

See Final BAA Section III. Paragraph 3.f. under Part 3 Cost Proposal.

[Back to Top](#)

Chart #6 shows a downselect to a single CEV contractor based partly (one-third) on a CEV demo flight. How will the government ensure that these competing demo flights will have similar levels of difficulty and technology demonstration? Please consider providing common goals and objectives that each of the contractor's flight vehicles must meet. What if one of the contractor's missions can't be accomplished due to a launch failure?

The CEV RFP will address these issues considering results of development planning and discussions under the CE&R BAA contracts.

[Back to Top](#)

Is the WBS written for a Code-T organization or for the Exploration Program? The WBS implies that Code-T will manage Exploration Operations.

Comment considered in the revised WBS dated June 21, 2004 posted on the Exploration Portal.

[Back to Top](#)

Design, Development, and Systems Engineering functions seem to be combined with Operations functions. This may be to facilitate design-build-operations collaboration. Please clarify.

Comment considered in the revised WBS dated June 21, 2004 posted on the Exploration Portal.

[Back to Top](#)

On page 9 of the BAA, section 4, last sentence states: 'Proposals shall be submitted in MS WORD or EXCEL, and may also include a PDF version'. Does NASA anticipate/desire receipt of a self-calculating Excel spreadsheet?

A self-calculating Excel spreadsheet would be greatly appreciated.

[Back to Top](#)

Is a flight demonstration required under the CEV development plan?

NASA expects that certain risks will require flight demonstration to buy down risk.

[Back to Top](#)

Should the system-of-systems concept address robotic precursors and surface systems?

Yes, if they are part of the offerors system-of-systems concept for lunar exploration.

[Back to Top](#)

If industry plans to propose cost sharing from private funding in addition to the Government funding would that be positive?

Cost sharing is permitted but not required, but the evaluation will be based upon the resultant impact to the quality and content of the proposal and not regarding cost sharing per se.

[Back to Top](#)

Has a small business liaison been established within Code T to facilitate small business participation?

SBIR/STTR and Technology Transfer responsibility within the Office of Exploration Systems has been established.

[Back to Top](#)

Is the July 16th proposal submission date intact and firm for this BAA?

Yes.

[Back to Top](#)



- + Freedom of Information Act
- + The President's Management Agenda
- + FY 2003 Agency Performance and Accountability Report
- + NASA Privacy Statement, Disclaimer, and Accessibility Certification
- + President's Commission on Moon, Mars and Beyond (PDF)



NASA Official: [Alex Pline](#)
Last Updated: September 29, 2004
+ Contact NASA